



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,737	11/30/2001	Soon-kyo Hong	1293.1290	4485
21171	7590	06/03/2005	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			NGUYEN, TU X	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2684	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/996,737

Applicant(s)

HONG ET AL.

Examiner

Tu X Nguyen

Art Unit

2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8 and 10-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 8, 15 and 16 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6, 10-14 and 17-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08).
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/16/04, claims 2, 10 and 23 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2-3, 10, 17-19, 21-34 and 37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al. (US Pub 2001/0021663) in view of Maekawa (US Patent 5,490,202).

Regarding claims 2, 10 and 23, Sawada et al. disclose an electronic apparatus comprising:

an electronic device including a body (see 21, fig.8); and

a battery (22) coupled to the body to supply current to said electronic device, said battery further comprising a memory unit (42,43, fig.8) to store information (see par. 0041, 0055.

Sawada et al. fail to disclose said battery further comprises a secondary power output port to connect to another device having a controller to supply current thereto to power the controller.

Maekawa discloses battery further comprises a secondary power output port to connect to another device having a controller to supply current thereto to power the controller (see col.6 lines 35-41). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sawada et al. with the above teaching of Maekawa in order to provide additional device for the portable telephone is equipped with a modem function which is required for computer communication (as suggested by Maekawa, see col.5 lines 14-19).

Regarding claims 3 and 24-25, the modified Sawada et al. disclose connecting another electronic apparatus to the battery (see Maekawa, 15, 33d, fig.20); and

Forming another communication pathway between another electronic apparatus and the memory unit to transfer the memory unit to transfer information between the memory unit and the another electronic apparatus (see Maekawa, 13, 34c, fig.20).

Regarding claims 17-19 and 34, the modified Sawada et al. disclose a drive record and/or reproduce data with respect to a recording medium (see Sawada, par.019).

Regarding claims 21 and 33, the modified Sawada et al. disclose battery unit supplies the stored energy to said memory unit (see Sawada, par. 0050).

Regarding claims 22 and 24, Sawada et al. disclose power connectors to connect said battery unit to the electronic device to supply the stored energy to the electronic device (see Maekawa, col.6 lines 35-45).

Regarding claim 23, Sawada et al. disclose everything as claim 1 above. More specifically, Sawada et al. disclose forming a communication pathway between the

Art Unit: 2684

electronic apparatus and the memory unit to transfer information between the electronic device and the memory unit (see par.0041).

Regarding claim 26, the modified Sawada et al. disclose the electronic apparatus and the another electronic apparatus are connected to the battery at the same time (see Maekawa, fig.20),

Regarding claims 27, the modified Sawada et al. disclose both the electronic apparatus and the another electronic apparatus are not connected to the battery at the same time (see Sawada, par.0019 and 22, fig.8, the battery 22 is an independent unit with its own CPU. Therefore, it is self functioned, playing music with headphone on, without the portable unit 21 attach thereto).

Regarding claims 28, the modified Sawada et al. disclose detaching the batter from the electronic apparatus prior to said connecting the another electronic apparatus to the battery (see Sawada, par.0019 and 22, fig.8, the battery 22 is an independent unit with its own CPU. Therefore, it is self functioned, playing music with headphone on prior to connect to anther electronic apparatus).

Regarding claim 29, the modified Sawada et al. disclose the electronic apparatus and the another electronic apparatus are of the same kind (see Sawada, par.0019).

Regarding claims 30-32, the modified Sawada et al. disclose everything as claim 1 above. However Sawada et al. do not mention connecting the electronic apparatus to another battery. The examiner takes an Official notice that the concept connecting the electronic apparatus to another battery is well known in the art. It would have been obvious the mobile unit 1, fig.1 is a complete independent unit that being power supply

Art Unit: 2684

by any other conventional battery pack that has no memory as long as the battery pack provide with appropriate connection, wattage, voltage, current, etc.

Regarding claim 37, the modified Sawada et al. disclose the another device retrieves information stored in the memory (see Maekawa, fig. 20).

3. Claims 3 and 11, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al. (US Pub 2001/0021663) in view of Japan Patent 2000165513A

Regarding claim 11 Sawada et al. fail to disclose a secondary communicating port to connect said memory unit to another device to exchange information with the another device and which comprises a Universal Serial Bus connector.

Japan Patent discloses a secondary communicating port to connect said memory unit to another device to exchange information with the another device and which comprises a Universal Serial Bus connector (see solution). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the modified Sawada with the above teaching of Japan Patent in order to provide a host computer to USB connector for exchange information with mobile device.

Cooper disclose a communication port to connect the memory unit to another device to exchange information with the another device" (see col.6 lines 30-34).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sawada et al. with the above teaching of

Art Unit: 2684

Cooper in order to enable an external computer to read and write to battery pack's memory.

4. Claims 4-5 and 12-13, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al. (US Pub 2001/0021663) Maekawa and further in view of Johnson et al. (US Patent 6,524,122).

Regarding claims 4 and 12, Sawada et al. fail to disclose communication port is installed to slide so that a free end of the communication port protrudes to connect to another device.

Johnson et al. disclose communication port is installed to slide so that a free end of the communication port protrudes to connect to another device (see fig.3, 4 and col.7 lines 37-60). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sawada et al. and Cooper with the above teaching of Johnson et al. in order to provide a torsion spring that helps the connector retractable and extractable smoothly.

Regarding claims 5 and 13, Sawada et al. fail to disclose communication port is disposed to be flipped out from a body of said battery at a predetermined angle.

Johnson et al. disclose communication port is disposed to be flipped out from a body of said battery at a predetermined angle (see col.5 lines 49-55). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sawada et al. and Cooper with the above teaching of

Art Unit: 2684

Johnson et al. in order to provide a retractable connector that can be used in variety of desired position including various angles.

5. Claims 6, 9, 14, 31 and 33, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al. (US Pub 2001/0021663) in view of Miyoshi et al. (US Pub. 2001/0044331).

Regarding claim 6, 9, 14, 31 and 33, Sawada et al. fail to disclose the memory unit is detachable from said battery.

Miyoshi et al. disclose the memory unit is detachable from said battery (see par.0039). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sawada et al. with the above teaching of Miyoshi et al. in order to provide a memory can be installed freely and also capable of supporting data write to the memory of the cellular phone (as suggested by Miyoshi et al. see par.0002).

6. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al. (US Pub 2001/0021663) in view of Tringali et al. (US Patent 6,545,891).

Regarding claim 20, Sawada et al. disclose communication pathway between memory unit and the electronic device (see par.0041). However, Sawada et al. fail to disclose a printed circuit board.

Tringali et al. disclose a printed circuit board (see col.2 lines 24-27). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

Art Unit: 2684

made to modify the system of Sawada et al. with the above teaching of Tringali et al. in order to provide memory device with support elements to plug/contact with other electronic device.

9. A battery for an electronic device, comprising: a memory unit to store information; and a battery unit to store energy and which is connected to said memory unit, wherein the battery is detachable from the electronic device.

7. Claims 35-36 and 38-40, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al. (US Pub 2001/0021663) in view of Maekawa (US Patent 5,490,202) and further in view of Wang (US Pub. 2003/0013506).

Regarding claim 35, the modified Sawada et al. fail to disclose the another device comprises a personal digital assistant.

Wang discloses disclose the another device comprises a personal digital assistant (see par.0022). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the modified Sawada et al. with the above teaching of wang in order to provide a battery assembly is applicable to variety of portable electronic products and bring convenience to the end-users.

Regarding claims 36 and 38-40, the modified Sawada et al. fail to disclose the another device comprises a computer, portable phone, a PDA and combinations thereof.

Art Unit: 2684

Wang discloses disclose the another device comprises a computer, portable phone, a PDA and combinations thereof (see par.0022). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the modified Sawada et al. with the above teaching of wang in order to provide a battery assembly is applicable to variety of portable electronic products and bring convenience to the end-users.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 7-8 and 15-16 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding independent claims 7 and 15, the prior arts fails to teach "battery further comprising a memory unit to store information, wherein the memory unit comprises a disk drive using a disk as a recording medium", as cited in the claims.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2684

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed Tu Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7883. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MAUNG NAY A, can be reached at 571-272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

TN

May 24, 2005


NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER